REMARKS

Claims 1-20 stand rejected. Claims 1-20 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants believe the amendments herein to the patent application do not add new matter to it.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dang et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,757,594 (hereinafter Dang).

CLAIM 1

Applicants respectfully contend that Dang does not teach subject matter recited within newly amended independent Claim 1. For instance, amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

> determining with an electronic sensor module whether a first electronic device of a plurality of electronic devices coupled to an equipment rack has been pulled out of said equipment rack, wherein said electronic sensor module is coupled to said first electronic device;

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang fails to teach that the electronic sensor module is coupled to the first electronic device as specifically recited in amended Claim 1. Since Dang fails to teach at least one element recited in amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang cannot anticipate amended Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 is allowable over Dang.

CLAIMS 8 and 15

Based on rationale similar to that discussed above with reference to amended independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that Dang cannot anticipate amended independent Claims 8 and 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 8 and 15 are allowable over Dang.

CLAIMS 2 and 9

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang cannot anticipate amended dependent Claims 2 and 9 based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claims 1 and 8. Moreover, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang does not teach subject matter recited within amended Claims 2 and 9. For instance, amended Claim 2 recites in part (emphasis added):

> wherein said <u>first electronic device</u> is selected from a <u>server computer</u>, a <u>router</u>, a <u>disk array</u>, a <u>computing device</u>, a <u>telecommunications device</u>, an electronic data storage device, and a piece of electronic equipment.

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang fails to teach that the first electronic device is selected from a server computer, a router, a disk array, a computing device, a telecommunications device, and a piece of electronic equipment as specifically recited in amended Claims 2 and 9. For example, Dang fails to even mention a server computer, a router and a telecommunications device. Since Dang fails to teach at least three elements recited in amended Claims 2 and 9, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang cannot anticipate amended Claims 2 and 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 2 and 9 are allowable over Dang.

CLAIMS 3, 10 and 17

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang cannot anticipate amended dependent Claims 3, 10 and 17 based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. Additionally, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang does not teach subject matter recited within amended Claims 3, 10 and 17. For instance, amended Claim 3 recites in part (emphasis added):

> wherein said <u>electronic sensor module</u> is selected from an optical sensor, a proximity sensor, a <u>mechanical switch</u>, an <u>electro-mechanical sensor</u>, a <u>mechanical sensor</u>, an <u>ultrasonic sensor</u>, a <u>hall-effect sensor</u>, and a <u>Linear Variable Differential Transformer</u> (LVDT).

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang fails to teach that the electronic sensor module is selected from a mechanical switch, an electro-mechanical sensor, a mechanical sensor, an ultrasonic sensor, a hall-effect sensor, and a Linear Variable Differential Transformer (LVDT) as specifically recited in amended Claims 3, 10 and 17. For example, Dang fails to even mention an ultrasonic sensor, a hall-effect sensor, and a Linear Variable Differential Transformer. Moreover, Applicant respectfully contends that Dang does not teach that the electronic sensor module is selected from a mechanical switch, an electro-mechanical sensor, and a mechanical sensor as explicitly recited in amended Claims 3, 10 and 17. Since Dang fails to teach at several elements recited in amended Claims 3, 10 and 17, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang cannot anticipate amended Claims 3, 10 and 17. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 3, 10 and 17 are allowable over Dang.

CLAIM 5

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang cannot anticipate amended dependent Claim 5 based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claims 1. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang does not teach subject matter recited within amended Claim 5. For instance, amended Claim 5 recites in part (emphasis added):

> wherein said electronic sensor module for detecting the proximity of a vertical support column of said equipment rack.

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang fails to teach that the electronic sensor module is for detecting the proximity of a vertical support column of the equipment rack as specifically recited in amended Claim 5. Since Dang fails to teach at least one element recited in amended Claim 5, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang cannot anticipate amended Claim 5. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 5 is allowable over Dang.

CLAIM 6

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang cannot anticipate amended dependent Claim 6 based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claims 1. Moreover, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang does not teach subject matter recited within amended Claim 6. For instance, amended Claim 6 recites in part (emphasis added):

> wherein said first electronic device coupled to said equipment rack with a rail slide.

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang fails to teach that the first electronic device is coupled to the equipment rack with a rail slide as specifically recited in amended

Claim 6. Since Dang fails to teach at least one element recited in amended Claim 6, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang cannot anticipate amended Claim 6. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 6 is allowable over Dang.

CLAIMS 7 and 14

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang cannot anticipate amended dependent Claims 7 and 14 based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claims 1 and 8. Additionally, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang fails to teach subject matter recited within amended Claims 7 and 14. For instance, amended Claim 2 recites in part (emphasis added):

> wherein said <u>electronic locking module</u> is coupled to <u>said second electronic device</u>.

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang does not teach that the locking module is coupled to the second electronic device as recited in amended Claims 7 and 14. Since Dang fails to teach at least one element recited in amended Claims 7 and 14, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang cannot anticipate amended Claims 7 and 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 7 and 14 are allowable over Dang.

CLAIM 16

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang cannot anticipate amended dependent Claim 16 based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claims 15. Moreover, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang does not teach subject matter recited within amended Claim 16. For instance, amended Claim 16 recites in part (emphasis added):

wherein said <u>first</u> electronic <u>equipment and said second electronic equipment</u> <u>are selected</u> from a server computer, a router, a disk array, a computing device, a telecommunications device, an electronic data storage device, and a piece of electronic equipment.

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang fails to teach that the first electronic equipment and the second electronic equipment are selected from a server computer, a router, a disk array, a computing device, a telecommunications device, and a piece of electronic equipment as specifically recited in amended Claim 16. For example, Dang fails to even mention a server computer, a router and a telecommunications device. Since Dang fails to teach at least three elements recited in amended Claim 16, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang cannot anticipate amended Claim 16. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 16 is allowable over Dang.

<u>CLAIM 20</u>

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang cannot anticipate amended dependent Claim 20 based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claims 15. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang does not teach subject matter recited within amended Claim 20. For instance, amended Claim 20 recites in part (emphasis added):

a <u>second electronic sensor module</u> for sensing when said <u>second</u> <u>electronic equipment has been pulled out</u> of said <u>equipment rack</u>, said <u>second</u> <u>electronic sensor module coupled to said second electronic equipment</u>; and

a <u>second electronic locking module</u> for <u>restricting said first electronic</u> <u>equipment from being pulled out</u> of said <u>equipment rack</u>, wherein said electronic control module coupled to said second electronic sensor module and said second electronic locking module.

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang fails to teach the above combinations as specifically recited in amended Claim 20. Since Dang fails to teach at least one element recited in amended Claim 20, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang cannot anticipate amended Claim 20. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 20 is allowable over Dang.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 1-20.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: _August 26, 2005_

Thomas M. Catale
Registration No.: 46,434

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Phone: (408) 938-9060
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069